

Generation of radiative neutrino mass in the linear seesaw framework, charged lepton flavor violation and dark matter

Arindam Das,^{1,2,3,*} Takaaki Nomura,^{1,†} Hiroshi Okada,^{4,‡} and Sourov Roy^{5,§}

¹*School of Physics, KIAS, Seoul 130-722, Korea*

²*Department of Physics & Astronomy,*

Seoul National University 1 Gwanak-ro, Gwanak-gu, Seoul 08826, Korea

³*Korea Neutrino Research Center, Bldg 23-312,*

Seoul National University, Sillim-dong, Gwanak-gu, Seoul 08826, Korea

⁴*Physics Division, National Center for Theoretical Sciences, Hsinchu, Taiwan 300*

⁵*Department of Theoretical Physics,*

Indian Association for the Cultivation of Science,

2A & 2B Raja S.C.Mullick Road, Jadavpur, Kolkata 700 032, INDIA

(Dated: April 10, 2017)

Abstract

We investigate a model with local $U(1)_{B-L}$ and discrete Z_2 symmetries where two types of weak isospin singlet neutrinos, vector-like charged lepton and exotic scalar fields are introduced. The linear seesaw mechanism is induced at one-loop level through Yukawa interactions associated with the standard model leptons and exotic fields. We also discuss lepton flavor violation and muon anomalous dipole magnetic moment induced by the new Yukawa interaction. In addition, our model has dark matter candidate which is the lightest Z_2 odd neutral particle. We calculate the relic density and constraints from direct detection.

Keywords:

*Electronic address: arindam@kias.re.kr

†Electronic address: nomura@kias.re.kr

‡Electronic address: macokada3hiroshi@cts.nthu.edu.tw

§Electronic address: tpsr@iacs.res.in

I. INTRODUCTION

Different experiments [1–5] on neutrino oscillation phenomena [6] are consistently giving the firm indications of the existence of the tiny neutrino mass and flavor mixing. The existence of the neutrino mass allows us to extend the Standard Model(SM) which is an essential window to search for the new physics. The simplest idea to extend the SM with an SM singlet right handed heavy Majorana neutrino was introduced in [7–10]. The heavy right handed Majorana neutrinos create a lepton number violating mass term ‘for the light neutrinos’ through a dimension five operator which can naturally explain the tiny neutrino masses. This procedure is called the seesaw mechanism. The seesaw scale (the mass scale of the heavy Majorana neutrinos) varies from the electroweak scale to the intermediate scale ($\sim 10^{15}$ GeV) as the neutrino Dirac Yukawa coupling (Y_D) varies from the scale of electron Yukawa coupling ($Y_e \sim 10^{-6}$) up to that of the top quark ($Y_t \sim 1$). If we consider the scale of the seesaw mechanism at the TeV scale or lower, the Dirac Yukawa coupling (Y_D) becomes very small ($\mathcal{O}(10^{-6})$) to produce appropriate light neutrino masses as suggested by neutrino oscillation experiments and cosmological observations.

Apart from the seesaw mechanism there is another type of mechanism where a small lepton number violating term plays a key role in generating the tiny neutrino mass. Such mechanism is commonly called as the canonical inverse seesaw mechanism [11, 12]. In this scenario unlike the seesaw mechanism, the light neutrino mass is not obtained by the suppression of the heavy neutrino mass. Due to the smallness of the lepton number violating parameter the heavy right handed neutrinos are pseudo-Dirac in nature. Their Dirac Yukawa couplings with the SM lepton doublets and the SM Higgs doublet could be order one to produce the light neutrino mass.

There is another type of TeV scale seesaw model which is called the linear seesaw [13–20]. This is a simple variation of the canonical inverse seesaw model. In linear seesaw model we introduce two heavy right handed SM singlet neutrinos with opposite lepton numbers where four right handed SM singlet Majorana heavy neutrinos are used as in canonical inverse seesaw. It has been shown in [18] that from the vacuum metastability bounds the unknown Dirac Yukawa coupling can be constrained. The vacuum stability bounds on the Dirac Yukawa coupling for the canonical type-I frame-work has been studied in [21, 22]. In our paper we consider the linear seesaw model where we have the (13) and (31) elements of the

neutrino mass matrix are nonzero but (22) and (33) elements to be zero; here the elements of neutrino mass matrix are considered in the basis of (ν_L, N_R^C, S_L) where N_R and S_L are SM singlet fermions. Whereas in inverse seesaw model (13) and (31) elements are zero, (33) element is nonzero and (22) may or may not be zero. In our model we generate the (13) and (31) elements of the neutrino mass matrix at the one loop level and study various features of this model.

In our model, we apply an extended gauged B–L framework with an additional Z_2 parity where we also introduce vector-like charged lepton, two types of weak isospin (which is equivalent to $SU(2)_L$) singlet neutrinos, and new scalar fields. The one loop induced linear seesaw mechanism is realized by Yukawa couplings associated with SM leptons and new fields. These Yukawa couplings also induce muon anomalous magnetic dipole moment (muon $g - 2$) where current measurement indicates $\Delta a_\mu = a_\mu^{\text{exp}} - a_\mu^{\text{SM}} = (28.8 \pm 8.0) \times 10^{-10}$ [23], and lepton flavor violating (LFV) processes such as $\ell_i \rightarrow \ell_j \gamma$ which is taken as constraints. In addition, the lightest Z_2 odd particle is stable which can be a good candidate of dark matter(DM) if it is neutral. Then we discuss relic density and constraint from direct detection for our DM candidate.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we introduce our model representing particle contents, new interactions and a neutrino mass matrix where we have studied neutrino masses and mixing in the light of neutrino experimental data. In Section III, we study lepton flavor violation and muon anomalous dipole magnetic moment. In Section IV we analyze dark matter physics in the model. In Section V, we give a conclusion.

II. MODEL

In this model we extend the SM with a $U(1)_{B-L}$ gauge group and a discrete Z_2 parity. The relevant part of the particle content has been displayed in Tab. I. The N_{R_i} is the heavy right handed Majorana neutrino with three generations to keep the model free from $U(1)_{B-L}$ anomalies. The fermion S_L is also a left handed Majorana heavy neutrino which has three generation and is neutral under $U(1)_{B-L}$ gauge group. The iso-singlet charged fermion E is vector-like with odd Z_2 parity. We also consider that E also has three generation in our model. Notice that the lightest Z_2 odd particle is stable and can be a good DM candidate if it is electrically neutral.

	$SU(2)$	$U(1)$	$U(1)_{B-L}$	Z_2
$L_L(\equiv [\nu_L, \ell_L]^T)$	2	$-\frac{1}{2}$	-1	+
e_R	1	-1	-1	+
$N_{Ri=1,2,3}$	1	0	-1	+
$S_{Lj=1,2,3}$	1	0	0	+
$E_{L,R\alpha=1,2,3}$	1	-1	-1	-
Φ	2	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	+
η	2	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	-
χ^-	1	-1	-1	-
ϕ	1	0	-1	+

TABLE I: The relevant part of the particle content

We can write the Lagrangian which is relevant for neutrino mass matrix at tree level as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{int} \supset y_\ell \overline{L_L} \Phi e_R + y_N \overline{L_L} \tilde{\Phi} N_R + y_{NS} \overline{N_R} S_L \phi + M_S \overline{S_L^C} S_L + h.c., \quad (\text{II.1})$$

where the first three terms induce the Dirac mass terms after Φ and ϕ getting VEV, and the fourth term with M_s is the lepton number violating Majorana mass term. We use the SM Higgs field Φ as

$$\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} \Phi^+ \\ \Phi_0 \end{pmatrix}, \Phi^* = \begin{pmatrix} \Phi^{+*} \\ \Phi_0^* \end{pmatrix}, \tilde{\Phi} = i\sigma_2 \Phi^* = \begin{pmatrix} \Phi_0^* \\ -\Phi^{+*} \end{pmatrix}, \Phi^- = \Phi^{+*} \text{ and } \eta = \begin{pmatrix} \eta^+ \\ \eta_0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{II.2})$$

where neutral components are written by $\Phi_0 \equiv (v + h)/\sqrt{2}$, and $\phi \equiv (v_\phi + \varphi)/\sqrt{2}$, $\eta_0 \equiv \frac{\eta^{Re} + i\eta^{Im}}{\sqrt{2}}$ and $\tilde{\eta} \equiv i\sigma_2 \eta^*$.

After the symmetry breaking one can write the neutrino mass matrix in Eq. II.3

$$\mathcal{L}_{mass} = \left(\overline{\nu_L^C} \quad \overline{N_R} \quad \overline{S_L^C} \right) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & m_D^* & 0 \\ m_D^\dagger & 0 & m_{NS} \\ 0 & m_{NS}^T & M_S \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_L \\ N_R^C \\ S_L \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{II.3})$$

where Dirac masses can be written by $m_D = y_N \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}}$ and $m_{NS} = y_{NS} v_\phi$. The B-L symmetry forbids the (22) term in the neutrino mass matrix of Eq. II.3.

At this point it must be pointed out that ϕ is a B–L charged scalar whose vacuum expectation value (VEV) is denoted by v_ϕ . The breaking of the electroweak and B–L symmetry is induced spontaneously through the potential:

$$V_1 = m_H^2 \Phi^\dagger \Phi + \frac{\lambda_1}{2} (\Phi^\dagger \Phi)(\Phi^\dagger \Phi) + m_\phi^2 \phi^\dagger \phi + \frac{\lambda_2}{2} (\phi^\dagger \phi)(\phi^\dagger \phi) + \frac{\lambda_{12}}{2} (\Phi^\dagger \Phi)(\phi^\dagger \phi). \quad (\text{II.4})$$

After $U(1)_{B-L}$ breaking, we have Z' boson whose mass is given by v_ϕ . In our analysis, we assume Z' boson is sufficiently heavy evading collider constraints. Then the mixing between Z and Z' is essentially given in terms of their masses as

$$\tan \theta_{Z-Z'} \approx \frac{m_Z^2}{m_{Z'}^2} \lesssim \mathcal{O}(10^{-4}) \quad (\text{II.5})$$

that is negligible tiny, where we take $m_{Z'} = 3.5$ TeV. Thus we will not discuss phenomenology of Z' . There are other two scalars η and χ^- with odd Z_2 parity, and the potential term containing the η and χ^- can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} V_2 = & m_\eta \eta^\dagger \eta + \frac{\lambda_\eta}{2} (\eta^\dagger \eta)(\eta^\dagger \eta) + m_{\chi^-} \chi^{-\dagger} \chi^- + \frac{\lambda_\chi}{2} (\chi^{-\dagger} \chi^-)(\chi^{-\dagger} \chi^-) + \frac{\lambda_{\eta\chi^-}}{2} (\eta^\dagger \eta)(\chi^{-\dagger} \chi^-) \\ & + \lambda_{\Phi\eta} (\Phi^\dagger \Phi)(\eta^\dagger \eta) + \lambda'_{\Phi\eta} (\Phi^\dagger \eta)(\Phi^\dagger \eta) + \frac{\lambda''_{\Phi\eta}}{2} [(\Phi^\dagger \eta)^2 + \text{c.c.}] + \lambda_{\eta\phi} (\eta^\dagger \eta)(\phi^\dagger \phi) \\ & + \mu (\Phi^T \cdot \eta) \chi^- \phi, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{II.6})$$

which is invariant under the prescribed gauge group and the Z_2 symmetry¹. Therefore the complete potential of our system will be given as

$$V_{\text{sys}} = V_1 + V_2. \quad (\text{II.7})$$

Using seesaw approximation, from Eq. II.3 we can write the effective 3×3 light neutrino mass matrix as

$$m_\nu = (m_D^* m_{NS}^{-1}) M_s (m_D^* m_{NS}^{-1})^T. \quad (\text{II.8})$$

Note that the light neutrino mass is directly proportional to the M_s . Therefore the degree of smallness regulates the smallness of the light neutrino mass and if $M_s \rightarrow 0$, the light

¹ $\mu (\Phi^T \cdot \eta) \chi^- \phi = \mu (\Phi^T \epsilon \eta) \chi^- \phi = \mu \begin{pmatrix} \Phi^+ & \Phi^0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \eta^+ \eta^0 \end{pmatrix} (\chi^- \phi) = \mu (\Phi^+ \eta^0 \chi^- \phi - \Phi^0 \eta^+ \chi^- \phi) \sim -\mu \Phi^0 \eta^+ \chi^- \phi$. After symmetry breaking, $-\mu \Phi^0 \eta^+ \chi^- \phi \supset -\mu \frac{v_\phi v}{\sqrt{2}} \eta^+ \chi^-$.




FIG. 1: Feynman diagram for the inverse seesaw

neutrino becomes massless, which is the inverse seesaw scenario [11, 12], and the Feynman diagram of the inverse seesaw operator is given in Fig. 1. If there is a non-zero (22) term in [25–27] in the neutrino mass matrix which provides a nontrivial contribution to light neutrino masses at the one loop level which does not vanish in the limit (33) term (M_S) going to zero. However, at the tree level the light neutrino masses go to zero in the limit $M_S \rightarrow 0$, even if $M_R \neq 0$.

There is another possibility to obtain the light neutrino mass through switching on the 31-term in the mass matrix in Eq.II.3. This can restore the small neutrino mass even if we have a vanishing M_s . However in our model it is not possible to generate the mass term at the tree level because $U(1)_{B-L}$ symmetry forbids us in writing the terms like $\overline{N_R^C} N_R \phi^*$, $\overline{L_L^c} \Phi^* S_L$ and $\overline{e_R^C} S_L \chi^+$ where the first and the second terms respectively induce 22- and 13(31)- terms of the neutrino mass matrix while the third term would contribute to a LFV process. Although some terms in neutrino mass matrix are forbidden at tree level, our particle content in Tab. I allows us to write the Dirac mass term of E and the gauge invariant Yukawa terms which can generate the 13(or 31)-term of the neutrino mass matrix through one loop diagram;

$$\mathcal{L} \supset (y_1)_{i\alpha} \overline{L_{Li}} \eta E_{R\alpha} + (y_2)_{\alpha j} \overline{E_{L\alpha}} S_{Lj}^C \chi^- + M_E \overline{E_{L\alpha}} E_{R\alpha}, \quad (\text{II.9})$$

where α and j is the generation index of the fermions E and S respectively. The third term of Eq. II.9 will contribute in the potential of the system. After generating the 31(or 13)




FIG. 2: Feynman diagram of the radiative loop to generate the 13(or 31) mass term in the neutrino mass matrix in Eq. II.10 to induce the linear seesaw.

term radiatively we can write the neutrino mass matrix ²

$$m_\nu^{\text{tree}+1\text{-loop}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & m_D^* & \delta_1^* \\ m_D^\dagger & 0 & m_{NS} \\ \delta_1^\dagger & m_{NS}^T & M_S \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{II.10})$$

Using seesaw approximation, from Eq. II.10 we can write the effective 3×3 light neutrino mass matrix as

$$\begin{aligned} (m_\nu^{\text{light}})^{\text{tree}+1\text{-loop}} &= \begin{pmatrix} m_D^* & \delta_1^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & m_{NS} \\ m_{NS}^T & M_s \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} m_D^\dagger \\ \delta_1^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} m_D^* & \delta_1^* \end{pmatrix} \left(\frac{-1}{m_{NS} m_{NS}^T} \right) \begin{pmatrix} M_s & -m_{NS} \\ -m_{NS}^T & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} m_D^\dagger \\ \delta_1^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \\ &= -(m_D^* m_{NS}^{-1}) M_s (m_D^* m_{NS}^{-1})^T + \\ &\quad (m_{NS}^T)^{-1} m_D^* \delta_1^\dagger + \delta_1^* m_D^\dagger (m_{NS}^{-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{II.11})$$

Therefore vanishing limit of M_s in Eq. II.11 will switch off the tree level mass term and the light neutrino mass term will be generated only from the 1-loop term leading to

$$m_\nu^{\text{light}^{1\text{-loop}}} = (m_{NS}^T)^{-1} m_D^* \delta_1^\dagger + \delta_1^* m_D^\dagger (m_{NS}^{-1}). \quad (\text{II.12})$$

Therefore, we can resolve the light neutrino mass through the radiative one loop process in the linear seesaw mechanism. The 1-loop diagram in Fig. 2 shows the radiative mass term

² It must be mentioned that in Eq. II.3 we have three generations of ν_L , three generations of N_R and S_L which makes the Dirac mass matrix, m_D as a 3×3 matrix as Y_N is carrying the flavors. The same structure is for Eq. II.10 where δ_1 is a 3×3 matrix keeping the other matrices same and the total mass matrix has 9×9 structure.

for the (13) and (31) elements in the neutrino mass matrix. Now solving the diagram, we can calculate the value of δ_1 . To do this we first rotate the charged scalar sector using an arbitrary orthogonal matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \chi^- \\ \eta^- \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} H_1^- \\ H_2^- \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{II.13})$$

From the Fig. 2 and using Eq. II.13 we write

$$\begin{aligned} (y_1)_{i\alpha} \overline{\nu_{L_i}} \eta^+ E_{R_\alpha} &= (y_1)_{i\alpha} \overline{\nu_{L_i}} E_{R_\alpha} (\sin \theta H_1^+ + \cos \theta H_2^+), \\ (y_2)_{\alpha j} \overline{E_{L_\alpha}} S_{L_j}^C \chi^- &= (y_2)_{\alpha j} E_{L_\alpha} S_{L_\alpha}^C (\cos \theta H_1^- - \sin \theta H_2^-), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{II.14})$$

$$\begin{aligned} -i(\delta_1)_{ij} &= \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} (-iy_2)_{\alpha j} P_R \frac{i(\not{k} + M_{E_\alpha})}{(k^2 - M_{E_\alpha}^2)} (-iy_1)_{i\alpha} P_R \sin \theta \cos \theta \left(\frac{i}{k^2 - m_{H_1}^2} - \frac{i}{k^2 - m_{H_2}^2} \right) \\ &= \frac{-i \sin \theta \cos \theta}{(4\pi)^2} (m_{H_1}^2 - m_{H_2}^2) \sum_{\alpha} (y_1)_{i\alpha} M_{E_\alpha} (y_2)_{\alpha j} \\ &\quad \int_0^1 dx \int_0^{1-x} dy \left[\frac{1}{x M_{E_\alpha}^2 + y m_{H_1}^2 + (1-x-y) m_{H_2}^2} \right] \\ &= \frac{-i \sin \theta \cos \theta}{(4\pi)^2} (m_{H_1}^2 - m_{H_2}^2) \sum_{\alpha} (y_1)_{i\alpha} M_{E_\alpha} (y_2)_{\alpha j} \\ &\quad \left[\frac{2 \left(M_{E_\alpha}^2 m_{H_1}^2 \ln \left[\frac{M_{E_\alpha}}{m_{H_1}} \right] + m_{H_2}^2 \left(m_{H_1}^2 \ln \left[\frac{m_{H_1}}{m_{H_2}} \right] + M_{E_\alpha}^2 \ln \left[\frac{m_{H_2}}{M_{E_\alpha}} \right] \right) \right)}{(M_{E_\alpha} - m_{H_1})(M_{E_\alpha} + m_{H_1})(M_{E_\alpha} - m_{H_2})(M_{E_\alpha} + m_{H_2})(m_{H_1}^2 - m_{H_2}^2)} \right] \\ &= -i \frac{\sin 2\theta}{16\pi^2} \sum_{\alpha} (y_1)_{i\alpha} (y_2)_{\alpha j} M_{E_\alpha} \\ &\quad \left[\frac{\left(M_{E_\alpha}^2 m_{H_1}^2 \ln \left[\frac{M_{E_\alpha}}{m_{H_1}} \right] + m_{H_2}^2 \left(m_{H_1}^2 \ln \left[\frac{m_{H_1}}{m_{H_2}} \right] + M_{E_\alpha}^2 \ln \left[\frac{m_{H_2}}{M_{E_\alpha}} \right] \right) \right)}{(M_{E_\alpha}^2 - m_{H_1}^2)(M_{E_\alpha}^2 - m_{H_2}^2)} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{II.15})$$

where we have assumed $M_{E_\alpha} \neq m_{H_1} \neq m_{H_2}$, and $m_{H_{1(2)}}$ is defined as the mass of the singly charged boson of $H_{1(2)}^\pm$. When we take $M_{E_\alpha} \gg m_{H_k}$ ($k = 1, 2$) typical size of δ_1 is approximately given by

$$(\delta_1)_{ij} \sim \frac{\sin 2\theta}{16\pi^2} \sum_{\alpha} \sum_k (y_1)_{i\alpha} (y_2)_{\alpha j} \frac{m_{H_i}}{M_{E_\alpha}} m_{H_k}, \quad (\text{II.16})$$

where $\ln[m_{H_k}/M_{E_\alpha}]$ factor is omitted here.

Depending on the mass scales and the scales of the Yukawa couplings one can justify the degree of smallness of the mass term δ_1 so as to reproduce the light neutrino masses at the correct scale.

A. Neutrino data

In this analysis we assume that $(m_{NS}^T)^{-1}m_D^* \ll 1$ which allows us to express the flavor eigenstates (ν) of the light Majorana neutrinos in terms of the mass eigenstates of the light (ν_m) and heavy (N_m) Majorana neutrinos where

$$\nu \sim \mathcal{N}\nu_m + \mathcal{R}N_m. \quad (\text{II.17})$$

For simplicity we may consider δ , m_D and m_{NS} are real quantities. Here

$$\mathcal{R} = m_D m_{NS}^{-1}, \quad \mathcal{N} = (1 - \frac{1}{2}\epsilon)U_{PMNS}, \quad \epsilon = \mathcal{R}^*\mathcal{R}^T \quad (\text{II.18})$$

and U_{PMNS} is the usual neutrino mixing matrices which can diagonalize m_ν in the following way

$$U_{PMNS}^T m_\nu U_{PMNS} = \text{diag}(m_1, m_2, m_3). \quad (\text{II.19})$$

Due to the presence of ϵ , the mixing matrix $\mathcal{N}$ is non-unitary. For simplicity we consider that there are three degenerate heavy neutrinos.

We consider a situation where the Dirac mass term carries the flavor, where as the δ term is proportional to unity. Therefore

$$m_\nu = \frac{m_D}{m_{NS}}\delta + \delta \frac{m_D}{m_{NS}} = 2\delta \frac{m_D}{m_{NS}} = 2\delta\mathcal{R} = U_{PMNS}^* D_{NH/IH} U_{PMNS}^\dagger, \quad (\text{II.20})$$

$$\mathcal{R} = \frac{1}{2\delta} U_{PMNS}^* D_{NH/IH} U_{PMNS}^\dagger, \quad (\text{II.21})$$

where NH(IH) represents the shorthand symbol for “normal(inverted) hierarchy”. Using the neutrino oscillation data $\sin^2 2\theta_{13} = 0.092$, $\sin^2 2\theta_{12} = 0.87$, $\sin^2 2\theta_{23} = 1.0$, $\Delta m_{12}^2 = m_2^2 - m_1^2 = 7.6 \times 10^{-5} \text{ eV}^2$ and $\Delta m_{23}^2 = |m_3^2 - m_2^2| = 2.4 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$ from [23, 24] we can write

$$D_{NH} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{0.1 * \Delta m_{12}^2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\Delta m_{12}^2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{\Delta m_{12}^2 + \Delta m_{23}^2} \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{II.22})$$

and

$$D_{IH} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\Delta m_{23}^2 - \Delta m_{12}^2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\Delta m_{23}^2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{0.1 * \Delta m_{23}^2} \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{II.23})$$

respectively. Therefore

$$\mathcal{R}^* \mathcal{R}^T = \frac{1}{4\delta^2} U_{PMNS} D_{\text{NH/IH}} U_{PMNS}^T U_{PMNS}^* D_{\text{NH/IH}} U_{PMNS}^\dagger. \quad (\text{II.24})$$

Using the updated result of the non unitarity matrix from the LFV bounds we can write $\mathcal{N}\mathcal{N}^\dagger \sim \mathbf{1} - \epsilon$. Due to its non-unitarity, the elements of the mixing matrix $\mathcal{N}$ are severely constrained by the combined data from the neutrino oscillation experiments, the precision measurements of weak boson decays, and the lepton-flavor-violating decays of charged leptons [38–42]. We update the results by using more recent data on the lepton-favor-violating decays [43–45]:

$$|\mathcal{N}\mathcal{N}^\dagger| = \begin{pmatrix} 0.994 \pm 0.00625 & 1.288 \times 10^{-5} & 8.76356 \times 10^{-3} \\ 1.288 \times 10^{-5} & 0.995 \pm 0.00625 & 1.046 \times 10^{-2} \\ 8.76356 \times 10^{-3} & 1.046 \times 10^{-2} & 0.995 \pm 0.00625 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{II.25})$$

Since $\mathcal{N}\mathcal{N}^\dagger \simeq \mathbf{1} - \epsilon$, we have the constraints on ϵ such that

$$|\epsilon| = \begin{pmatrix} 0.006 \pm 0.00625 & < 1.288 \times 10^{-5} & < 8.76356 \times 10^{-3} \\ < 1.288 \times 10^{-5} & 0.005 \pm 0.00625 & < 1.046 \times 10^{-2} \\ < 8.76356 \times 10^{-3} & < 1.046 \times 10^{-2} & 0.005 \pm 0.00625 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{II.26})$$

The most stringent bound is given by the (12)-element which is from the constraint on the lepton-flavor-violating muon decay $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$. Using these bounds we can find the minimum value of δ_1 as $\delta_{1_{min}} \sim \mathcal{O}(10 \text{ eV})$.

III. CHARGED LEPTON FLAVOR VIOLATION

In our model the fermion E_α and the scalar η is involved in the charged lepton flavor violation (cLFV) processes through the interaction

$$\mathcal{L}_{int} \supset \overline{E_{R\alpha}} (y_1)_{\alpha i}^\dagger L_{Li} \tilde{\eta} \supset \frac{(y_{1_{i\alpha}})^\dagger}{\sqrt{2}} \overline{E_{R\alpha}} \ell_{Li} (\eta^{\text{Re}} - i\eta^{\text{Im}}), \quad (\text{III.1})$$




FIG. 3: Feynman diagram for the charged lepton flavor violation processes $\ell_i \rightarrow \ell_j \gamma$.

where $\tilde{\eta} \equiv i\sigma_2 \eta^*$. The Feynman diagram for the corresponding $\ell_i \rightarrow \ell_j \gamma$ process(es) are given in Fig. 3. The scattering amplitude for Fig. 3 is given as³

$$\begin{aligned}
 iM &= \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} \overline{u(p_2)} \left[-\frac{-i(y_1^\dagger)_{j\alpha} P_R}{\sqrt{2}} \right] \frac{i(\not{k} + \not{p}_1) - \not{p}_3 + M_{E_\alpha}}{(k + p_1 + p_3)^2 - M_{E_\alpha}^2} (ie\gamma_\mu) \frac{i(\not{k} + \not{p}_1) + M_{E_\alpha}}{(k + p_1)^2 - M_{E_\alpha}^2} \\
 &\quad \left[-\frac{-i(y_1^\dagger)_{\alpha i} P_L}{\sqrt{2}} \right] u(p_1) \frac{1}{k^2 - m_\eta^2} \epsilon(p_3)^\mu \\
 &= i(2e p_1 \cdot \epsilon^*) \overline{u(p_2)} \left[a_R P_R + a_L P_L \right] u(p_1),
 \end{aligned} \tag{III.2}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 (a_R)_{ji} &= -\sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \sum_k^{\text{Re,Im}} \frac{(y_1)_{j\alpha} (y_1^\dagger)_{\alpha i}}{2(4\pi)^2} m_{\ell i} \int dx dy dz \frac{yz \delta(x + y + z - 1)}{(x + y) M_{E_\alpha}^2 + z m_{\eta^k}^2} \\
 &= -\sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \sum_k^{\text{Re,Im}} \frac{(y_1)_{j\alpha} (y_1^\dagger)_{\alpha i}}{2(4\pi)^2} m_{\ell i} \left[\frac{M_{E_\alpha}^6 - 6M_{E_\alpha}^4 m_{\eta^k}^2 + 3M_{E_\alpha}^2 m_{\eta^k}^4 + 2m_{\eta^k}^6 + 12M_{E_\alpha}^2 m_{\eta^k}^4 \ln \left[\frac{M_{E_\alpha}}{m_{\eta^k}} \right]}{12(M_{E_\alpha}^2 - m_{\eta^k}^2)^4} \right],
 \end{aligned} \tag{III.3}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 (a_L)_{ji} &= -\sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \sum_k^{\text{Re,Im}} \frac{(y_1)_{j\alpha} (y_1^\dagger)_{\alpha i}}{2(4\pi)^2} m_{\ell j} \int dx dy dz \frac{xz \delta(x + y + z - 1)}{(x + y) M_{E_\alpha}^2 + z m_{\eta^k}^2} \\
 &= -\sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \sum_k^{\text{Re,Im}} \frac{(y_1)_{j\alpha} (y_1^\dagger)_{\alpha i}}{2(4\pi)^2} m_{\ell j} \left[\frac{M_{E_\alpha}^6 - 6M_{E_\alpha}^4 m_{\eta^k}^2 + 3M_{E_\alpha}^2 m_{\eta^k}^4 + 2m_{\eta^k}^6 + 12M_{E_\alpha}^2 m_{\eta^k}^4 \ln \left[\frac{M_{E_\alpha}}{m_{\eta^k}} \right]}{12(M_{E_\alpha}^2 - m_{\eta^k}^2)^4} \right].
 \end{aligned} \tag{III.4}$$

Now

$$\mathcal{BR}(\ell_i \rightarrow \ell_j \gamma) \sim \frac{48\pi^3 \alpha_{em} C_{ij}}{G_F^2 m_{\ell_i}^2} \left(\left| a_L^{\eta^{\text{Re}}} + a_L^{\eta^{\text{Im}}} \right|^2 + \left| a_R^{\eta^{\text{Re}}} + a_R^{\eta^{\text{Im}}} \right|^2 \right)_{ji}, \tag{III.5}$$

³ In our convention $Q_E = -1$.

where $\alpha_{em} \approx 1/137$ is the fine structure constant, $G_F \approx 1.17 \times 10^{-5} \text{ GeV}^{-2}$ is Fermi constant, and C_{ij} is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} C_{ij} &\approx 1 \text{ for } (i, j) = (\mu, e) \\ &\approx 0.1784 \text{ for } (i, j) = (\tau, e) \\ &\approx 0.1736 \text{ for } (i, j) = (\tau, \mu). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{III.6})$$

The current experimental bound on $\mathcal{BR}(\ell_i \rightarrow \ell_j \gamma)$ is respectively given by [31], [32] at 90 % CL.

$$\mathcal{BR}(\ell_\mu \rightarrow \ell_e \gamma) \lesssim 4.2 \times 10^{-13}, \quad \mathcal{BR}(\ell_\tau \rightarrow \ell_e \gamma) \lesssim 3.3 \times 10^{-8}, \quad \mathcal{BR}(\ell_\tau \rightarrow \ell_\mu \gamma) \lesssim 4.4 \times 10^{-8}. \quad (\text{III.7})$$

We can avoid the constraints by choosing the Yukawa coupling y_1 so that off-diagonal elements of $a_{L(R)}$ are sufficiently small.

The diagram in Fig. 3 also contributes to the muon anomalous magnetic moment Δa_μ when $i = j = 2$, and it is given by

$$\Delta a_\mu = -m_\mu \left[a_L^{\eta^{\text{Re}}} + a_R^{\eta^{\text{Re}}} + a_L^{\eta^{\text{Im}}} + a_R^{\eta^{\text{Im}}} \right]_{22}, \quad (\text{III.8})$$

including the real and imaginary parts of the neutral scalar η . The current experiments [28–30] report that its deviation is $(28.8 \pm 8.0) \times 10^{-10}$. Taking $M_{E_\alpha} > m_{\eta^k}$, we roughly obtain $\Delta a_\mu \sim \sum_\alpha (y_1)_{2\alpha} (y_1^\dagger)_{\alpha 2} (m_\mu / M_{E_\alpha})^2 / (96\pi^2)$. Thus we find that product of Yukawa coupling $\sum_\alpha (y_1)_{2\alpha} (y_1^\dagger)_{\alpha 2}$ should be order one or larger to obtain sizable Δa_μ . In addition, exotic particles are preferred not to be too heavy as $\mathcal{O}(1) \text{ TeV}$ for getting sizable muon $g - 2$.

IV. DARK MATTER SCENARIO

Neutral component of η can be a dark matter (DM) candidate. Here we assume the real part to be DM: $\eta_R \equiv X$. General analysis has been done by ref. [33], where the DM mass is greater than the mass of W boson.⁴ We are interested in lower range $M_X \leq m_W$ since it is preferred to obtain sizable muon $g - 2$, and thus we focus on this range. Also we note that annihilation modes from Higgs portal is subdominant when we require to evade the

⁴ In this case, DM mass should be greater than 500 GeV, and coannihilation should also be taken into consideration because of oblique parameter.




FIG. 4: Feynman diagram for DM annihilation in s -channel (a) and u -channel (b).

direct detection constraint such as LUX experiment which is discussed below. Under this situation, dominant mode comes from the same Yukawa coupling as Eq.III.1, which gives d-wave dominance in the limit of massless final state. The interaction Lagrangian is again given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{int} \supset \frac{(y_1)_{i\alpha}}{\sqrt{2}} \bar{\ell}_{Li} E_{R\alpha} (\eta^{\text{Re}} + i\eta^{\text{Im}}) \supset \frac{(y_1)_{i\alpha}}{\sqrt{2}} \bar{\ell}_{Li} E_{R\alpha} X. \quad (\text{IV.1})$$

The relevant Feynman diagrams for the DM annihilation are given in Fig. 4. Then the nonrelativistic cross section to explain the relic density of DM is obtained by

$$\sigma v_{\text{rel}} \approx \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \frac{|(y_1)_{i\alpha} (y_1^\dagger)_{\alpha j}|^2 M_X^6}{240\pi (M_{E_\alpha}^2 + M_X^2)^4} v_{\text{rel}}^4 \equiv d_{\text{eff}} v_{\text{rel}}^4. \quad (\text{IV.2})$$

Here we apply the relative velocity expansion approximation as follows:

$$\Omega h^2 \approx \frac{10.7 \times 10^9 [\text{GeV}^{-1}] x_f^3}{20 \sqrt{g_*} M_P d_{\text{eff}}}, \quad (\text{IV.3})$$

where $M_P \approx 1.22 \times 10^{19}$ GeV is the Planck mass, $g_* \approx 100$ is the total number of effective relativistic degrees of freedom at the time of freeze-out, and $x_f \approx 25$ is defined by M_X/T_f at the freeze out temperature (T_f), and d_{eff} is the contribution to the d -wave. We find that $\sum |(y_1)_{i\alpha} (y_1^\dagger)_{\alpha j}|^2$ should be sizable to obtain observed relic density. Note also that even if y_1 is large we can obtain small scale of δ_1 in Eq. II.16 by small values of y_2 and θ .

Spin independent scattering cross section can be found via Higgs portal. The relevant terms in Higgs potential is given in second line of RHS in Eq. II.6. Then the CP even Higgs mixing in basis of (φ, h) is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} \varphi \\ h \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \alpha & -\sin \alpha \\ \sin \alpha & \cos \alpha \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} H_1^0 \\ H_2^0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{IV.4})$$

where H_2^0 is the SM Higgs and its mass $m_{H_2^0} \approx 125$ GeV, and H_1^0 is another neutral Higgs with vacuum expectation value as v' . Then its formula is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_N &\approx \frac{m_N^4}{4(m_N + M_X)^2\pi} \left(\frac{C_{2XH_1^0}s_\alpha}{m_{H_1^0}^2} + \frac{C_{2XH_2^0}c_\alpha}{m_{H_2^0}^2} \right)^2 \times 3.29 \times 10^{-29} \text{cm}^2, \\ C_{2XH_1^0} &= (\lambda_{\Phi\eta} + \lambda'_{\Phi\eta} + \lambda''_{\Phi\eta})s_\alpha + \lambda_{\eta\phi}c_\alpha \frac{v_\phi}{v}, \\ C_{2XH_2^0} &= (\lambda_{\Phi\eta} + \lambda'_{\Phi\eta} + \lambda''_{\Phi\eta})c_\alpha - \lambda_{\eta\phi}s_\alpha \frac{v_\phi}{v},\end{aligned}\tag{IV.5}$$

where $m_N \approx 0.939$ GeV is the neutron mass. Here we give a brief estimation, where we simply fix several parameters as $\lambda \equiv \lambda_{\Phi\eta} \approx \lambda'_{\Phi\eta} \approx \lambda''_{\Phi\eta} \approx \lambda_{\eta\phi}$ and $m_{H^0} \equiv m_{H_1^0} \approx m_{H_2^0} = 125$ GeV. Then the resulting cross section is simplified as

$$\sigma_N \approx \frac{9\lambda^2 m_N^4}{4\pi(m_N + M_X)^2 m_{H^0}^4} \times 3.29 \times 10^{-29} \text{cm}^2,\tag{IV.6}$$

notice here that it does not depend on s_α , v , and v' . The stringent cross section is found to be $\sigma_N \approx 2.2 \times 10^{-46}$ cm² at $M_X \approx 50$ GeV reported by LUX experiment [46], which are supported by CoGENT [47] and CREST [48], although their results are more relaxed. Therefore in our case, the bound on λ is found to be

$$\lambda \lesssim 0.022.\tag{IV.7}$$

Here we discuss order estimation to fit the experimental values such as relic density of DM and muon $g - 2$ satisfying LFVs, where notice here that the crucial parameter is y_1 and we do not need to include the neutrino sector because of a lot of independent parameters. First of all, the correct relic density can be achieved by taking $|(y_1)_{i\alpha}(y_1^\dagger)_{\alpha j}|$ to be order one, where we expect all the scales of exotic masses are of the order of 100 – 1000 GeV. Also sizable muon $g - 2$ is achieved if we take $|(y_1)_{21}|^2 + |(y_1)_{22}|^2 + |(y_1)_{23}|^2$ to be order one. While LFVs restricts some components of y_1 . For example, the most stringent constraint arises from $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$, and its Yukawa combination $(y_1)_{11}(y_1)_{21}^* + (y_1)_{12}(y_1)_{22}^* + (y_1)_{13}(y_1)_{23}^*$ should be taken to be order $\mathcal{O}(10^{-4})$ to satisfy this bound, where we respectively take the one-loop function and the mediated fields to be order one and 500 GeV. Comparing these three combinations, one finds that there are allowed regions by controlling each component of y_1 .

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have proposed an extension of SM with local $U(1)_{B-L}$ symmetry and discrete Z_2 symmetry where exotic leptons and scalar particles are introduced. In particular, two types of weak isospin singlet neutrinos, N_{R_i} and S_{L_i} are introduced.

Since N_{R_i} is charged under the $U(1)_{B-L}$, it has to have three generations, due to the anomaly cancelation. While S_{L_i} does not have $B-L$ charge that suggests that the number of flavor for S_L can be arbitrary. Thus we assume to be three generations of S_L for simplicity. The model induces linear seesaw mechanism through one loop diagram in which Z_2 odd particles propagate, if Majorana mass of S_{L_i} is suppressed. In addition, the lightest Z_2 odd neutral particle can be a good DM candidate.

We have shown a formula for the component of the neutrino mass matrix δ_1 which is generated by one-loop diagram. Then the neutrino mass matrix is given by δ_1 and the Dirac mass parameters in our neutrino sector through linear seesaw mechanism. To fit the neutrino oscillation data, the order of δ_1 is required to be $\delta_1 \gtrsim \mathcal{O}(10 \text{ eV})$ which can easily be realized choosing the values of relevant parameters in the formula. We have also derived formulas of muon $g-2$ and lepton flavor violating decay $\ell \rightarrow \ell' \gamma$ at one-loop level. Furthermore, relic density of DM and DM-nucleon scattering are discussed assuming neutral component of inert doublet scalar is dark matter candidate. We then find that our model can accommodate with neutrino oscillation data via linear seesaw mechanism, sizable muon $g-2$, and the relic density of DM, satisfying the constraints from lepton flavor violations and the direct detection experiment of DM.

Such a model can also be tested at the collider. A small value of δ_1 ensures a sizable mixing between the SM light leptons and the BSM fermions. Through such mixings the BSM fermions can be produced at the high energy collider such as Large Hadron Collider (LHC) and 100 TeV pp collider, using W boson and Z boson exchange from the charged current and neutral current interactions respectively. In fact due to the B-L model framework, the pair production of such fermions can be tested through the B-L gauge boson. These fermions can display the multilepton final states through the corresponding charged current and neutral current interactions which will be interesting in the High Luminosity era of the high energy collider/s. Moreover a general parameter structure can also be adopted for such models as discussed in [49, 50] using the Casas-Ibarra parametrization[51].

In addition, we have several Z_2 odd scalars including DM where heavier particles decay into SM leptons and DM via Yukawa interactions. Thus the signals of charged leptons with missing transverse momentum are expected as a signature of these scalar particles.

A general version of this model under the $U(1)_X$ gauge group can also be considered in future. The general analysis using the conformal $U(1)_X$ model has been realized in [52, 53].

Acknowledgments

The work AD is supported by the Korea Neutrino Research Center which is established by the National Research Foundation of Korea(NRF) grant funded by the Korea government(MSIP) (No. 2009-0083526).

-
- [1] K. Abe *et al.* [T2K Collaboration] Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 041801 (2011). [arXiv:1106.2822[hep-ex]]
 - [2] P. Adamson *et al.* [MINOS Collaboration], “Improved search for muon-neutrino to electron-neutrino oscillations in MINOS,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 181802 (2011). [arXiv:1108.0015 [hep-ex]].
 - [3] Y. Abe *et al.* [DOUBLE-CHOOZ Collaboration], “Indication for the disappearance of reactor electron antineutrinos in the Double Chooz experiment,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 131801 (2012). [arXiv:1112.6353 [hep-ex]].
 - [4] F. P. An *et al.* [DAYA-BAY Collaboration], “Observation of electron-antineutrino disappearance at Daya Bay,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 171803 (2012). [arXiv:1203.1669 [hep-ex]].
 - [5] J. K. Ahn *et al.* [RENO Collaboration], “Observation of Reactor Electron Antineutrino Disappearance in the RENO Experiment,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 191802 (2012). [arXiv:1204.0626 [hep-ex]].
 - [6] J. Beringer *et al.* [Particle Data Group Collaboration], “Review of Particle Physics (RPP),” Phys. Rev. D **86**, 010001 (2012). doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.010001
 - [7] P. Minkowski, Phys. Lett. B **67**, 421 (1977);

- [8] T. Yanagida, in *Proceedings of the Workshop on the Unified Theory and the Baryon Number in the Universe* (O. Sawada and A. Sugamoto, eds.), KEK, Tsukuba, Japan, 1979, p. 95;
- [9] M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond, and R. Slansky, *Supergravity* (P. van Nieuwenhuizen et al. eds.), North Holland, Amsterdam, 1979, p. 315; S. L. Glashow, *The future of elementary particle physics*, in *Proceedings of the 1979 Cargèse Summer Institute on Quarks and Leptons* (M. Levy et al. eds.), Plenum Press, New York, 1980, p. 687;
- [10] R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. **44**, 912 (1980).
- [11] R. N. Mohapatra, “Mechanism for understanding small neutrino mass in superstring theories,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **56** (1986) 561;
- [12] R. N. Mohapatra and J. W. F. Valle, “Neutrino mass and baryon-number nonconservation in superstring models,” Phys. Rev. D **34**, 1642 (1986).
- [13] D. Wyler and L. Wolfenstein, “Massless Neutrinos in Left-Right Symmetric Models,” Nucl. Phys. B **218**, 205 (1983). doi:10.1016/0550-3213(83)90482-0
- [14] E. K. Akhmedov, M. Lindner, E. Schnapka and J. W. F. Valle, “Left-right symmetry breaking in NJL approach,” Phys. Lett. B **368**, 270 (1996) doi:10.1016/0370-2693(95)01504-3 [hep-ph/9507275].
- [15] E. K. Akhmedov, M. Lindner, E. Schnapka and J. W. F. Valle, “Dynamical left-right symmetry breaking,” Phys. Rev. D **53**, 2752 (1996) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.53.2752 [hep-ph/9509255].
- [16] M. Malinsky, J. C. Romao and J. W. F. Valle, “Novel supersymmetric SO(10) seesaw mechanism,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 161801 (2005) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.95.161801 [hep-ph/0506296].
- [17] M. B. Gavela, T. Hambye, D. Hernandez and P. Hernandez, “Minimal Flavour Seesaw Models,” JHEP **0909**, 038 (2009) doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2009/09/038 [arXiv:0906.1461 [hep-ph]].
- [18] S. Khan, S. Goswami and S. Roy, “Vacuum Stability constraints on the minimal singlet TeV Seesaw Model,” Phys. Rev. D **89**, no. 7, 073021 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.89.073021 [arXiv:1212.3694 [hep-ph]].
- [19] G. Bambhaniya, S. Goswami, S. Khan, P. Konar and T. Mondal, “Looking for hints of a reconstructible seesaw model at the Large Hadron Collider,” Phys. Rev. D **91**, 075007 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.91.075007 [arXiv:1410.5687 [hep-ph]].
- [20] S. Kashiwase, H. Okada, Y. Orikasa and T. Toma, “Two Loop Neutrino Model with Dark Matter and Leptogenesis,” Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **31**, no. 20n21, 1650121 (2016)

- doi:10.1142/S0217751X16501219 [arXiv:1505.04665 [hep-ph]].
- [21] W. Rodejohann and H. Zhang, “Impact of massive neutrinos on the Higgs self-coupling and electroweak vacuum stability,” JHEP **1206**, 022 (2012) doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2012)022 [arXiv:1203.3825 [hep-ph]].
 - [22] J. Chakraborty, M. Das and S. Mohanty, “Constraints on TeV scale Majorana neutrino phenomenology from the Vacuum Stability of the Higgs,” Mod. Phys. Lett. A **28**, 1350032 (2013) doi:10.1142/S0217732313500326 [arXiv:1207.2027 [hep-ph]].
 - [23] C. Patrignani *et al.* [Particle Data Group], “Review of Particle Physics,” Chin. Phys. C **40**, no. 10, 100001 (2016). doi:10.1088/1674-1137/40/10/100001
 - [24] F. P. An *et al.* [DAYA-BAY Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 171803 (2012).
 - [25] A. Pilaftsis, “Radiatively induced neutrino masses and large Higgs neutrino couplings in the standard model with Majorana fields,” Z. Phys. C **55**, 275 (1992) doi:10.1007/BF01482590 [hep-ph/9901206].
 - [26] P. S. B. Dev and A. Pilaftsis, “Minimal Radiative Neutrino Mass Mechanism for Inverse Seesaw Models,” Phys. Rev. D **86**, 113001 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.113001 [arXiv:1209.4051 [hep-ph]].
 - [27] P. S. Bhupal Dev and A. Pilaftsis, “Light and Superlight Sterile Neutrinos in the Minimal Radiative Inverse Seesaw Model,” Phys. Rev. D **87** (2013) no.5, 053007 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.87.053007 [arXiv:1212.3808 [hep-ph]].
 - [28] G. W. Bennett *et al.* [Muon G-2 Collaboration], “Final Report of the Muon E821 Anomalous Magnetic Moment Measurement at BNL,” Phys. Rev. D **73**, 072003 (2006) [hep-ex/0602035].
 - [29] F. Jegerlehner and A. Nyffeler, “The Muon $g-2$,” Phys. Rept. **477**, 1 (2009) [arXiv:0902.3360 [hep-ph]].
 - [30] M. Benayoun, P. David, L. Delbuono and F. Jegerlehner, “Upgraded Breaking Of The HLS Model: A Full Solution to the $\tau^- e^+ e^-$ and ϕ Decay Issues And Its Consequences On $g-2$ VMD Estimates,” Eur. Phys. J. C **72**, 1848 (2012) [arXiv:1106.1315 [hep-ph]].
 - [31] A. M. Baldini *et al.* [MEG Collaboration], “Search for the Lepton Flavour Violating Decay $\mu^+ \rightarrow e^+ \gamma$ with the Full Dataset of the MEG Experiment,” arXiv:1605.05081 [hep-ex].
 - [32] J. Adam *et al.* [MEG Collaboration], “New constraint on the existence of the $\mu^+ \rightarrow e^+ \gamma$ decay,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 201801 (2013) [arXiv:1303.0754 [hep-ex]].
 - [33] T. Hambye, F.-S. Ling, L. Lopez Honorez and J. Rocher, “Scalar Multiplet Dark Matter,”

- JHEP **0907**, 090 (2009) Erratum: [JHEP **1005**, 066 (2010)] doi:10.1007/JHEP05(2010)066, 10.1088/1126-6708/2009/07/090 [arXiv:0903.4010 [hep-ph]].
- [34] D. V. Forero, M. Tortola and J. W. F. Valle, “Neutrino oscillations refitted,” Phys. Rev. D **90**, no. 9, 093006 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.90.093006 [arXiv:1405.7540 [hep-ph]].
 - [35] M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, M. Maltoni and T. Schwetz, “Updated fit to three neutrino mixing: status of leptonic CP violation,” JHEP **1411**, 052 (2014) doi:10.1007/JHEP11(2014)052 [arXiv:1409.5439 [hep-ph]].
 - [36] B. Pontecorvo, “Inverse beta processes and nonconservation of lepton charge,” Sov. Phys. JETP **7**, 172 (1958) [Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **34**, 247 (1957)].
 - [37] Z. Maki, M. Nakagawa and S. Sakata, “Remarks on the unified model of elementary particles,” Prog. Theor. Phys. **28**, 870 (1962). doi:10.1143/PTP.28.870
 - [38] S. Antusch, C. Biggio, E. Fernandez-Martinez, M. B. Gavela and J. Lopez-Pavon, “Unitarity of the Leptonic Mixing Matrix,” JHEP **0610**, 084 (2006). [arXiv:hep-ph/0607020].
 - [39] A. Abada, C. Biggio, F. Bonnet, M. B. Gavela and T. Hambye, “Low energy effects of neutrino masses,” JHEP **0712**, 061 (2007). [arXiv:0707.4058 [hep-ph]].
 - [40] A. Ibarra, E. Molinaro and S. T. Petcov, “TeV Scale See-Saw Mechanisms of Neutrino Mass Generation, the Majorana Nature of the Heavy Singlet Neutrinos and $(\beta\beta)_{0\nu}$ -Decay,” JHEP **1009**, 108 (2010); [arXiv:1007.2378 [hep-ph]].
 - [41] A. Ibarra, E. Molinaro and S. T. Petcov, “Low Energy Signatures of the TeV Scale See-Saw Mechanism,” Phys. Rev. D **84**, 013005 (2011); [arXiv:1103.6217 [hep-ph]].
 - [42] D. N. Dinh, A. Ibarra, E. Molinaro and S. T. Petcov, “The $\mu - e$ Conversion in Nuclei, $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma, \mu \rightarrow 3e$ Decays and TeV Scale See-Saw Scenarios of Neutrino Mass Generation,” JHEP **1208**, 125 (2012) [Erratum-ibid. **1309**, 023 (2013)]. [arXiv:1205.4671 [hep-ph]].
 - [43] J. Adam et. al. [MEG Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 171801, (2011). [arXiv: 1107.5541 [hep-ex]]
 - [44] B. Aubert et. al. [BABAR Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 021802, (2010). [arXiv: 0908.2381 [hep-ex]]
 - [45] See, for summary, B. O’ Leary et. al. [SuperB Collaboration], arXiv: 1008.1541 [hep-ex].
 - [46] D. S. Akerib *et al.* [LUX Collaboration], “Results from a search for dark matter in the complete LUX exposure,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, no. 2, 021303 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.118.021303 [arXiv:1608.07648 [astro-ph.CO]].

- [47] C. E. Aalseth *et al.* [CoGeNT Collaboration], “Search for An Annual Modulation in Three Years of CoGeNT Dark Matter Detector Data,” arXiv:1401.3295 [astro-ph.CO].
- [48] G. Angloher *et al.*, “Results from 730 kg days of the CRESST-II Dark Matter Search,” Eur. Phys. J. C **72**, 1971 (2012) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-012-1971-8 [arXiv:1109.0702 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [49] A. Das and N. Okada, “Inverse seesaw neutrino signatures at the LHC and ILC,” Phys. Rev. D **88**, 113001 (2013) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.88.113001 [arXiv:1207.3734 [hep-ph]].
- [50] A. Das and N. Okada, “Bounds on heavy Majorana neutrinos in type-I seesaw and implications for collider searches,” arXiv:1702.04668 [hep-ph].
- [51] J. A. Casas and A. Ibarra, “Oscillating neutrinos and $\mu\mu\mu \rightarrow e, \gamma$,” Nucl. Phys. B **618**, 171 (2001) doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(01)00475-8 [hep-ph/0103065].
- [52] S. Oda, N. Okada and D. s. Takahashi, “Classically conformal U(1) extended standard model and Higgs vacuum stability,” Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 1, 015026 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.015026 [arXiv:1504.06291 [hep-ph]].
- [53] A. Das, S. Oda, N. Okada and D. s. Takahashi, “Classically conformal U(1) extended standard model, electroweak vacuum stability, and LHC Run-2 bounds,” Phys. Rev. D **93**, no. 11, 115038 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.115038 [arXiv:1605.01157 [hep-ph]].